REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12 and 14-18 have been amended to more clearly define the invention.

Support for the amendments is found in the Application in connection with Figure 6, in the existing claims and other places. Specifically, support for "automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks" is found in the Application on page 10 lines 9-12 and other places. Support for "automatically selecting" a "particular task schedule from" a "plurality of displayable task schedules, in response to received information identifying an event" is found in the Application on page 10 lines 22-25 and other places. Support for the "decision information" comprising "at least one executable procedure" is found on page 8 lines 19-22 and other places

I. Objection to claims.

Claim 9 is objected because of the use of "automatically programmatically".

The term is amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion to recite "automatically and programmatically". Consequently, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of claims 3 and 5 under 35 USC 112.

Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 USC 112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Specifically, claim 3 is rejected as it is unclear how a "logical procedure" would be entered within "decision information".

Claim 1 is amended and now recites "user entry of decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure" that is the "decision information" invokes an executable procedure as correctly interpreted by the Examiner. Consequently this ground of rejection is deemed to be satisfied and its withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Claim 5 is rejected based on an apparent contradiction between claim 1 reciting an identifier is assigned based on received information and claim 5 stating automatically assigning a task representative identifier based on application of the received information in response to received information identifying an event.

Claim 1 is amended and now recites "applying the received decision information and initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure, in response to received information identifying an event, to automatically select a task from a plurality of different tasks and assign a task representative identifier representing a selected task to be performed by said particular entity, to said task schedule associated with said particular entity". Claim 5 is amended to recite "decision information initiates execution of said at least one executable...in response to received information identifying an event". Therefore, claims 1 and 5 unambiguously indicate the system acts to "automatically select a task from a plurality of different tasks and assign a task representative identifier" in response to received information identifying an event". Further, the term "in response to received information identifying an event" is unambiguous and different from "received decision information" and is fully compliant with 35 USC 112 requirements. Consequently this ground of rejection is deemed to be satisfied and its withdrawal is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1-6 and 8-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent application 2004/0039626 - Voorhees. These claims are deemed to be patentable for the reasons given below.

Amended claim 1 recites a method for "assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of displayable task schedules" comprising "initiating display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to received information identifying an event, said particular task schedule being associated with a particular entity of said corresponding plurality of different entities; receiving decision information entered via said at least one interface menu; and applying the received decision information and initiating execution of said at least one executable

procedure, in response to received information identifying an event, to automatically select a task from a plurality of different tasks and assign a task representative identifier representing a selected task to be performed by said particular entity, to said task schedule associated with said particular entity". These features are not shown (or suggested) in Voorhees.

The system of claim 1 initiates display of an "interface menu supporting user entry of decision information" for "initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities" in response to "received information identifying an event". The system advantageously enables user customizable, automatic, event driven, healthcare worker (and medical device) task scheduling. For example, assume, "Dr. Jones is the Radiologist who protocols all spiral CT exams. When a spinal CT is ordered, that exam will be added to Dr. Jones' protocol work list 1, and at the same time, can be added to a CT technologist work list 1 of exams to be performed on the day for which it was ordered. When Dr. Jones protocols the exam, it would be removed from his work list 1. When the exam is tracked to the Begin Procedure step, it can be removed from the technologist work list 1" (Application page 12 lines 10-15). This **automatic** task selection and assignment significantly improves hospital personnel and resource allocation, planning and operation and is not suggested by the user driven manual scheduling or appointment systems of the cited references. Such scheduling or appointment systems merely schedule tasks or appointments that are selected **by a user** and in contrast to the claimed system, do NOT automatically select tasks from multiple available tasks or select a worker from multiple workers and assign tasks to the selected worker.

The Voorhees system concerns "a system and method for tracking appointment data". The Voorhees system "includes a clinic engine operable to allow an appointment target to identify a first block of time as available-to-meet time and an appointment engine operable to make available at least a portion of the first block of time to an appointment seeker in response to an appointment request. The system may also include an appointment seeker interface that allows the appointment seeker to schedule a first appointment during the first block of time and a notification engine operable to notify the appointment target of the first appointment. In other embodiments, the clinic engine may be further operable to allow the appointment target to identify allowable locations for the first appointment" (Voorhees par 0001,

par. 0007). Consequently, Voorbees describes an appointment management system that fails to show or suggest "decision information" that initiates "execution of at least one executable procedure" that "automatically" selects a "task from a plurality of different tasks" and assigns an "identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities" in response to "received information identifying an event".

The Rejection on page 11 states that automated steps are performed after input by a user and that Voorhees teaches a system allowing a user to enter information enacting automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning a task to one of the schedules managed by the Voorhees system. The Rejection relies on Voorhees Figure 8 and paragraphs 0023, 0025, 0029, 0041 and 0043-4. These sections describe an appointment patient scheduling system allowing a user to select an appointment. Contrary to the Rejection statement, Voorhees nowhere shows or suggests initiation of "execution of at least one executable procedure" that "automatically" selects a "task from a plurality of different tasks". Voorhees does not teach automatic selection of a "task" by an "executable procedure" at all. Voorhees teaches user manual selection of an appointment from available appointment times ("Appointment seeker 118, 120, 122 may search for an individual or type of target using appointment engine 106" An appointment seeker – **a user** "may select a target and receive real time confirmation of the appointment and its time, place, etc." Voorhees paragraph 0025).

Further, the word "selecting" means "To pick out from among several" or to "make a choice" (Webster II New College dictionary 1995). Therefore, initiation of "execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks" involves the exercise of **discretionary** choice by an "executable procedure" in choosing a "task from a plurality of different tasks". Under no reasonable interpretation can the Voorhees system of user manual selection of an appointment be interpreted to show or suggest "execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks". A user is not an executable procedure and an appointment is not a task as defined in the claims and specification (a task comprises at least one of (a) a medical procedure identifier for a scheduled procedure, (b) a time and date of performance of a medical procedure, (c) patient medical record information, (d) location of performance of a medical procedure, (e) patient type identifier and (f) patient physical characteristics" – see claim 4). The Rejection, in making this argument, is

contradicting the plain ordinary meaning of the word "selecting" as involving **discretionary** choice and the contextual meaning of the terms in the specification.

The Rejection alleges that the Voorhees system "updates the targets calendar to indicate non-availability of the selected time" and thereby shows or suggests "assigning an identifier to the schedule of the target" (Rejection page 11 lines 16-18). However, Voorhees does not even mention "task" or "identifier". Further, "execution of at least one executable procedure" to "automatically" assign an "identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities" comprises an act of discretionary choice and selection of the "particular task schedule" from a "plurality of displayable task schedules" performed by "execution of at least one executable procedure". Under no reasonable interpretation can the Voorhees system of **user manual** selection of an appointment be interpreted to show or suggest "execution of at least one **executable procedure** for" automatically "**assigning** an identifier representing **a selected task** to a **particular task schedule** of a **plurality** of displayable task schedules". These features are entirely absent from Voorhees and are also incompatible with the Voorhees system. The Voorhees system gives a user the discretion to make this selection whereas in contrast, in the claimed system selection is done automatically by an executable procedure and NOT by a user. The claimed capability directly addresses the problem of inefficiency and error introduced by the type of manual operation taught by Voorhees. The Rejection in alleging that Voorhees teaches "execution of at least one **executable procedure** for" automatically "**assigning** an identifier representing **a selected task** to a **particular task schedule** of a **plurality** of displayable task schedules" is making erroneous, unsupported speculation that is in direct conflict with the teachings of the Voorhees reference relied on.

Voorhees nowhere provides any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling description of, or contemplates use of, user entered "decision information" for "initiating execution of at least one executable procedure" for automatically selecting a "task" from "a plurality of different tasks" without user intervention in response to "received information identifying an event". Voorhees merely "allows" a user (the appointment seeker) to "schedule a first appointment during" a "first block of time" identified by a user employing a "clinic engine" (Voorhees par 0007). Voorhees is a user drive system ("a clinic engine operable to allow" a user an ("**appointment target**") to "identify a first block of time"; "allows" a user an ("**appointment seeker**") to "schedule a first appointment" etc (Voorhees par 0007). Voorhees does

NOT suggest use of "decision information" for "initiating execution of at least one executable procedure" that "automatically" without user intervention assigns an "identifier representing a selected task to be performed" and "automatically" selects a task to be performed "from a plurality of different tasks" in response to "received information identifying an event".

Voorhees in par. 0023-5, 0029 and 0043-4 relied on in the Rejection on page 4 nowhere shows , suggests, or provides any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling description of "automatically" selecting a task "from a plurality of different tasks" by applying "decision information" in response to "received information identifying an event". The Voorhees sections relied on merely describe a passive appointment system without any ability to automatically (without user intervention) "select" and "assign" tasks in response to "received information identifying an event". Voorhees par. 0029 specifically relied, on just shows update of an appointment calendar to indicate a period of time of a worker is no longer available.

Voorhees in par. 0029 states "update engine 242" recognizes "when a seeker" (a user) "has scheduled an appointment with a target and automatically updates the targets calendar to indicate that the scheduled time is no longer available for appointment". That is update engine 242 updates a schedule in response to user action not "decision information" and does not "select" and "assign" tasks in response to "received information identifying an event". Voorhees in par. 0029 also states "in some embodiments, update engine 242 may also recognize when information located within legacy system 236 has changed and initiate an **updating** of the **information** located within **legacy** system 236 to reflect the change". However, Voorhees nowhere describes what information is updated or even what legacy system 236 is. Consequently, Voorhees fails to show, suggest or provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of "automatically" selecting a task "from a plurality of different tasks" in response to "received information identifying an event".

Further, in par 0025 of Voorhees an identification of a Doctors schedule is done manually by a user (an appointment seeker) using clinic engine 104. Specifically, par. 0025 states "appointment seeker 118, 120, 122 may search for an individual or type of target using appointment engine 106". Consequently, Voorhees teaches manually driven appointment scheduling which is **fundamentally different** to the automatic system claimed and does not suggest "initiating execution of at least one executable procedure" for "automatically" selecting a task "from a plurality of

different tasks" in response to "received information identifying an event". Voorhees nowhere mentions or contemplates such selection.

There is no mention, discussion or contemplation anywhere in Voorhees of use of user entered **"decision information"** for "initiating execution of at least one executable procedure" to select and assign tasks in response to "received information identifying an event". Indeed Voorhees teaches use of a system that is incompatible in its operation with the claimed system. Further, there is no recognition in Voorhees of the advantages of the user customizable, automatic, event driven, healthcare worker (and medical device) automatic task selection and assignment features or any other motivation or reason for modifying Voorhees system to incorporate the claimed features.

Appointment and scheduling systems exemplified by Voorhees are used to schedule use of resources, personnel and patients to perform **already identified tasks.** Such systems do not have the ability to **select and assign** tasks or to **select and assign** particular workers in response to "received information identifying an event". Such scheduling systems also do NOT have the ability to "assign" tasks based on the data or actions performed on the data and specifically "based on the application of the received decision information". This capability allows a user to efficiently automatically schedule personnel and devices to deliver healthcare to a patient based on occurrence of events. This capability and associated claimed arrangement is not contemplated by the cited reference. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of amended claim 1 under 35 USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Amended dependent claim 2 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 2 is also considered to be patentable because Voorhees does not show (or suggest) a system involving "initiating execution of at least one executable procedure to automatically select said particular task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules, in response to said received information identifying an event". Voorhees is a user drive system ("a clinic engine operable to allow" a user an (**"appointment target"**) to "identify a first block of time"; "allows" a user an (**"appointment seeker"**) to "schedule a first appointment" etc (Voorhees par 0007). Voorhees does NOT suggest a system for **"automatically** selecting said particular task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules, in response to said received information identifying an event".

Voorhees also does not mention or contemplate use of "decision

information" that "automatically" assigns an "identifier representing a selected task to be performed" and "automatically" selects a task to be performed "from a plurality of different tasks" in response to "received information identifying an event" in combination with initiating "display of menu elements prompting a user to identify" data associated with "decision information" used in "assigning the task representative identifier to the task schedule associated with the particular entity in response to a predetermined event". Voorhees Figure 4 paragraphs 0026, 0040 and 0043 mention preferences and privileges may be called (par. 0043) in response to user login but provides negligible disclosure on what such preferences and privileges are. The only related disclosure appears to be in par 0039 which states "in other words, a group of targets may be treated collectively as a single target, with each target in the group sharing some set of assigned privileges". Voorhees provides no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of "menu elements **prompting** a user to identify at least one of (a) the predetermined **event triggering** application of the decision information in assigning the task representative identifier to the task schedule, (b) a source of **the** decision information, (c) decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for identifying a task schedule for listing the task representative identifier".

The Rejection also states on page 12 relying on Figures 8 and 9 and paragraphs 40-41, that a Voorhees computer system "makes a decision as to which doctors will satisfy an appointment seekers information" and thereby shows or suggests "initiating execution of at least one executable procedure to automatically select said particular task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules" (Rejection page 11). Paragraph 0040 and Figures 8 and 9 describe enabling a **user** to search for a doctor matching **user entered** criteria and to select an appointment time on a schedule of Doctor found by the search **and selected by a user.** This is a user driven search and selection function based on user entered search criteria and is not performed "automatically" or by "initiating execution of at least one executable procedure to automatically select said particular task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules". Indeed the selection is made **by a user** in Voorhees since if multiple Doctors match the user criteria, a user selects one of them and if only one Doctor matches the user criteria, the user still decides whether or not to make an appointment with this Doctor. Therefore the user exercises discretion NOT an executable application. This discretion is not allowed in the claimed arrangement since selection of "said particular task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules" is done by the "at least one executable procedure".

Amended dependent claim 3 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 3 is also considered to be patentable because Voorhees does not show (or suggest) a system in which the "the decision information initiates execution of at least one logical procedure for processing data associated with a task to identify a task schedule for incorporating the task representative identifier". Voorhees does not mention or contemplate initiation of "execution of" a "logical procedure" for "processing data associated with a task to identify a **task** schedule". Voorhees paragraphs 0023, 0025, 0029, 0041 and 0043-44 do not mention such a logical procedure at all. Voorhees par. 0036 mentions conditional logic comprising rules which "may control how data that is applied to the domain is distributed to users in the domain". However, a "domain" as used in Voorhees appears to be some group of resources used by a grouping of users and has no bearing on (and provides no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of) a "logical procedure" for "processing data associated with a task to identify a **task** schedule" in a system that "automatically" selects a "particular task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules, in response to said decision information and received information identifying an event".

Dependent claim 4 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claims 1 and 3.

Amended dependent claim 5 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 5 is also considered to be patentable because Voorhees does not contemplate initiation of "execution of said at least on executable procedure" for automatically and **programmatically** without user intervention "assigning" a **task representative identifier** to "at least one of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different **entities**" comprising "at least one of (a) a category of users, (b) one or more users currently designated to perform a healthcare worker role and (c) a medical device or system". Contrary to the Rejection statements on page 5, Voorhees fails to provide any suggestion of the combination of features of claim 5. Specifically, Figure 6 and paragraphs 0023-25, 0041 and 0043-44 fail to suggest "**application**" of user entered "**decision information**" that "automatically" and "programmatically without user intervention" assigns an "identifier representing a selected task to be performed by" at least one of (a) a category of users, (b) one or more users currently designated to perform a healthcare worker role and (c) a medical device or system".

Dependent claim 6 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 6 is also considered to be patentable because Voorhees

does not show (or suggest) a system in which the "the decision information identifies the predetermined event and...the predetermined event corresponds to at least one of (a) patient admission, (b) beginning of a medical procedure, (c) end of a medical procedure and (d) a user defined event based on information acquired". Voorhees paragraphs 0023-5, 0029 and 0043-4 relied on in the Rejection concern user driven appointment management. The relied on reference sections do NOT show or suggest "decision information" that "automatically" assigns an "identifier representing a selected task to be performed" and "automatically" selects a task to be performed "from a plurality of different tasks" in response to "received information identifying an event" that corresponds to "at least one of (a) patient admission, (b) beginning of a medical procedure, (c) end of a medical procedure and (d) a user defined event based on information acquired".

Amended Independent claim 8 is considered to be patentable for reasons given in connection with claims 1-6 and for additional reasons. Claim 8 recites a method for "assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of task schedules" comprising "initiating display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for assigning a task representative identifier to a selected task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, said selected task schedule being associated with a particular entity of said corresponding plurality of different entities and accessible by the particular entity, the decision information including data identifying: at least one executable procedure for processing data associated with a task to select a task schedule for incorporating the task representative identifier and for assigning said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said selected task schedule, and an event for triggering application of said at least one executable procedure; receiving decision information entered via the at least one interface menu; and automatically initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure to select said selected task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules and assign said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said selected task schedule, in response to received information identifying occurrence of a triggering event".

Voorhees is not concerned with and does not contemplate "automatically initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure to select said selected task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules and assign said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said

particular entity, to said selected task schedule, in response to received information identifying occurrence of a triggering event". Voorhees paragraphs 0023-5, 0029 and 0043-4 relied on in the Rejection pages 6 and 7 concern **user driven** appointment management. The relied on reference sections do NOT show or suggest "automatically initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure" to "select" a "selected task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules, in **response** to" received "information identifying occurrence of a triggering **event**". Voorhees in par. 0029 states "update engine 242" recognizes "when a seeker" (a user) "has scheduled an appointment with a target and automatically updates the targets calendar to indicate that the scheduled time is no longer available for appointment". That is update engine 242 updates a schedule in response to **user action** not predetermined "decision information" and automatic "initiation of an executable procedure" and does not exercise discretion and "select" and "assign" tasks in response to "received information identifying occurrence of a triggering event". Voorhees in par. 0029 also states "in some embodiments, update engine 242 may also recognize when information located within legacy system 236 has changed and initiate an **updating** of the **information** located within **legacy** system 236 to reflect the change". However, Voorhees nowhere describes what information is updated or even what legacy system 236 is. Consequently, Voorhees fails to show, suggest or provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of "automatically initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure to select said selected task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules, in response to received information identifying occurrence of a triggering event".

The Voorhees system does NOT have the ability to "assign" tasks based on the data or actions performed on the data and "in response" to "occurrence of the triggering event". Voorhees does NOT show or suggest "initiating display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for assigning a task representative identifier to a task schedule associated with a **particular** entity and accessible by the particular entity". This capability allows a user to efficiently schedule personnel and devices to deliver healthcare to a patient based on **occurrence of events**. For example, a "radiologist may use the system of the present inventions to create an entry on an appropriate entity's "to be scheduled" worklist, including the radiologist's own worklist, such as by using a menu option. The menu option may programmatically schedule such an event if a certain code is entered by or for the radiologist upon completion of the analysis of the results, i.e. the results code acts as a triggering event to schedule the more detailed ultrasound" (Application page 11 lines 5-15). These features and capability are nowhere suggested in Voorhees.

The decision information initiates execution of at least one executable procedure and "may condition allocation of the task to a task schedule associated with a particular entity upon one or more occurrences of a phenomenon which may or may not be coincident. For example, it may be desirable to programmatically condition assigning a subsequent task to a user or entity based on what also has or is happening as indicated by a response entered into the same or another worksheet 1" (Application page 10 line 22 to page 11 line 2). Voorhees dose NOT show or suggest use of "decision information" for initiating execution of "at least one executable procedure for processing data associated with a task to **select** a task schedule for incorporating the task representative identifier and for assigning said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said selected task schedule". Voorhees dose NOT show or suggest "an **event** for **triggering** application of said at least one executable **procedure**" to **select** a "task schedule" associated with a "particular entity" and accessible by the "particular entity". The identification of the Doctors schedule is done manually by a user (an appointment seeker) using clinic engine 104 in Voorhees and NOT by an "executable procedure" initiated by data in "decision information". Specifically, par. 0025 states "appointment seeker 118, 120, 122 may search for an individual or type of target using appointment engine 106". Consequently, Voorhees teaches manually driven appointment scheduling which is **fundamentally different** to the automatic system claimed and does not suggest "automatically initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure to **select** said selected task schedule from said plurality of displayable task schedules **and assign** said task representative identifier representing a task to be performed by said particular entity, to said selected task schedule, in response to received information identifying occurrence of a triggering event".

Amended dependent claim 9 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 8 and for reasons given in connection with claim 1. Claim 9 is also considered to be patentable because Voorhees does not show (or suggest) the "at least one interface menu supports user entry of decision information including said data identifying said at least one executable procedure for automatically and programmatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to said selected task schedule of said plurality of displayable task schedules, in response to received information identifying an event". Voorhees also does not suggest a system including the combination of features of claim 9 in which the "the data associated with a task comprises at least one of (a) a medical procedure identifier for a scheduled procedure, (b) a time and date of

performance of a medical procedure, (c) patient medical record information, (d) location of performance of a medical procedure, (e) patient type identifier and (f) patient physical characteristics".

Dependent claim 10 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 8 and for reasons given in connection with claims 1, 6 and 8. Claim 10 is also considered to be patentable because Voorhees does not show (or suggest) a system including the combination of features of claim 10 in which the "the **triggering event** corresponds to at least one of (a) patient admission, (b) beginning of a medical procedure, (c) end of a medical procedure and (d) a user defined event based on acquired information".

Dependent claim 11 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 8. Claim 11 is also considered to be patentable because Voorhees does not show (or suggest) a system including the combination of features of claim 11 including "acquiring the data associated with a task".

Amended dependent claim 12 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 8. Claim 12 is also considered to be patentable because Voorhees does not show (or suggest) a system including the combination of features of claim 12 in which "at least one executable procedure conditions allocation of the task to the task schedule associated with the particular entity upon **coincidence** of a **plurality of occurrences**, and...further including acquiring data to identify the coincidence of the plurality of occurrences". Contrary to the Rejection statement on page 7, Voorhees paragraphs 0023-5, 0029 and 0043-4 relied on concern user driven appointment management and do NOT show or suggest the ability to "assign" tasks based on the data or actions performed on the data and specifically "based on the application of the received decision information" and "in response to occurrence of the triggering event". The reference also fails to show or suggest "assigning" tasks "in response to occurrence of the triggering event" and specifically in response to "coincidence of a plurality of occurrences". The reference also fails to show or suggest "acquiring data to **identify the coincidence** of the plurality of occurrences". The cited reference passages simply do not show or suggest such features and the Rejection fails to make any showing that specifically identifies where such a combination of features are present.

Amended dependent claim 13 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 8. Claim 13 is also considered to be patentable because

Voorhees does not show (or suggest) a system including the combination of features of claim 13 in which the "the triggering event is **conditioned** upon coincidence of a plurality of **occurrences**, and...further including acquiring data to identify the **coincidence** of the plurality of occurrences". Contrary to the Rejection statement on page 7, Voorhees paragraphs 0023-5, 0029 and 0043-4 relied on concern user driven appointment management and do NOT show or suggest the ability to "assign" tasks based on the data or actions performed on the data and specifically "based on the application of the received decision information" and "in response to occurrence of the triggering event". The reference also fails to show or suggest "assigning" tasks "in response to occurrence of the triggering event" and specifically in response to "**coincidence of a plurality of occurrences**". The reference also fails to show "acquiring data to **identify the coincidence** of the plurality of occurrences". The cited reference passages simply do not show or suggest such features and the Rejection fails to make any showing that specifically identifies where such a combination of features are present.

Dependent claim 14 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 8. Claim 14 is also considered to be patentable because Voorhees does not show (or suggest) a system including the combination of features of claim 14 in which "said at least one executable procedure removes a task representative identifier from the task schedule associated with the particular entity in response to occurrence of a triggering event". Contrary to the Rejection statement on page 8, Voorhees paragraphs 0023-5, 0029 and 0043-4 relied on concern user driven appointment management and do NOT show or suggest the ability to "assign" tasks based on the data or actions performed on the data and specifically "based on the application of the received decision information" and "in response to occurrence of the triggering event". The relied on sections fail to make any suggestion of "applying the received **decision information** in **removing** a task representative identifier from the **task schedule** associated with the particular entity in response to occurrence of a **triggering event**". Removal of task identifiers is not discussed or mentioned anywhere in the cited reference.

Amended Independent claim 15 is considered to be patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1 and for additional reasons. Claim 15 is also considered to be patentable because Voorhees does not show (or suggest) "a method for providing a user interface for assigning an identifier to at least one of a plurality of displayable task schedules" comprising "in response to a user command" initiating "display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information

for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically and programmatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to received information identifying an event, said particular task schedule being associated with a particular entity of said corresponding plurality of different entities; and initiating display of an updated task schedule including said selected task having said assigned identifier associated with the particular entity, in response to received information identifying an event".

As previously explained Voorhees is not concerned with, and does **not** contemplate use of "decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically and programmatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities, in response to received information identifying an event". Voorhees also does show or suggest "initiating display of at least one interface menu supporting user entry of decision information for initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically and programmatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules". Voorhees paragraphs 0023-5, 0029 and 0043-4 relied on concern **user driven** appointment management and do NOT show or suggest "initiating display of an updated task schedule including said selected task having said assigned identifier associated with the particular entity, in response to received information identifying an event". The systems described do NOT have the ability for "automatically and programmatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule" in "response to received information identifying an event". This capability allows a system to efficiently schedule personnel and devices to deliver healthcare to a patient based on occurrence of events **without user** intervention. This capability and associated claimed arrangement is absent from the cited reference.

Amended Independent claim 16 is considered to be patentable for reasons given in connection with claims 1-15 and for additional reasons.

Amended Independent claim 17 is considered to be patentable for

reasons given in connection with claims 1-15 and for additional reasons.

Amended Independent claim 18 is a system claim mirroring method claim 1 and is considered to be patentable for same reasons as claim 1.

Dependent claim 19 embodies the steps of claim 1 and is considered to be patentable for the same reasons as claim 1.

IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent application 2004/0039626 – Voorhees in view of US Patent application 2002/0156672 – Burko. These claims are deemed to be patentable for the reasons given below.

Amended dependent claim 7 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Voorhees with Burko does not disclose or suggest "said received decision information initiates execution of said at least one executable procedure to prioritize a plurality of **task** representative **identifiers** of a **task schedule** associated with a particular entity in response to occurrence of a triggering **event**".

The Burko system "relates to systems and methods for providing integrated scheduling and management of services that are provided to a customer by a professional...a customer accesses a website in his/her own language to selectively schedule, modify, or manage an appointment, and may selectively obtain or update information at the website. The scheduling of an appointment includes utilizing a pre-established rule-based system that uses factors to prioritize appointments, such as information relating to the customer, the urgency of the appointment, and other types of factors. The **customer selects** the professional with whom an appointment is desired and suggests a desired appointment time to the system. The system then determines if that time is available for the professional and either schedules the appointment or presents a variety of other related times to the **customer for selection**" (Burko paragraphs 0010-0013). In the Burko system as with the Voorhees system, a user selects an appointment. Therefore, Burko with Voorhees does not show or suggest "initiating execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities" in

response to "received information identifying an event". Burko with Voorhees does not show or suggest this feature in combination with "initiating execution of said at least one executable procedure to prioritize a plurality of **task** representative **identifiers** of a **task schedule** associated with a particular entity in response to occurrence of a triggering **event**".

Further incorporating the Burko feature identified in the Rejection in the Voorhees system results in a user driven appointment selection and prioritization system that does not initiate "execution of at least one executable procedure for automatically selecting a task from a plurality of different tasks and assigning an identifier representing a selected task to a particular task schedule of a plurality of displayable task schedules associated with a corresponding plurality of different entities" in response to "received information identifying an event". The combined system also does not "prioritize a plurality of **task** representative **identifiers** of a **task schedule** associated with a particular entity in response to occurrence of a triggering event". Prioritizing appointments of Burko with Voorhees does not show or suggest prioritizing "a plurality of task representative identifiers of a task schedule. A task is not an appointment prioritizing **appointments** does not suggest prioritizing **tasks** in a task schedule in the context of the claim 1 system. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-19 is respectfully requested.

V. Information Disclosure Statement

An attached Information Disclosure Statement cites US Patent 5,692,125 by Schloss. This patent discloses an appointment scheduling system. However, similar to Voorhees, Schloss is concerned with scheduling already selected tasks previously selected for performance by a user. Therefore Schloss is considered to be distinguished from this Application for similar reasons to Voorhees. Specifically, for example, Schloss does not show or suggest use of "decision information" that initiates "execution of at least one executable procedure" that "automatically" selects a "task from a plurality of different tasks".

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the Application is in condition for allowance, and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: ; November 18, 2005

Alexander J. Burke
Reg. No. 40,425

Siemens Corporation,
Customer No. 28524
Tel. 732 321 3023
Fax 732 321 3030